

Manganelli & Bodon to set aside the lectotype is in accord with the concept stated in the Preamble of the Code 'to promote stability and universality in the scientific names of animals'. The proposed neotype selection of Giusti et al. will maintain the name and concept of the genus *Hydrobia* as currently understood by the majority of authors and I therefore fully support the application.

(7) Naggs et al. (BZN 56: 143–144) have commented that Giusti et al. have not proposed a neotype from among the series of 74 paralectotypes. However, Draparnaud (1805) did not record a locality for *Cyclostoma acutum*, either in the original publication (other than 'France' in the title) or on the labels of the original type series. Selection of a neotype from among the paralectotypes would have the unwanted consequence that the type locality of *C. acutum* would remain unknown. Moreover, in France there is more than one species with less convex shells having a similar appearance to that of *Hydrobia acuta*. The HYDROBIINAE are often poorly defined by shell characters, whereas the genitalia are much more characteristic. The proposed neotype selection will have the advantage that not only will a precise locality be fixed, but anatomical data as well, and the identity of *H. acuta* will be unambiguously secured.

#### Additional references

- Alzona, C. 1971. Malacofauna Italica. Catalogo e bibliografia dei molluschi viventi, terrestri e d'acqua dolce. *Atti della Società Italiana di Scienze Naturali e del Museo Civico di Storia Naturale. Milano*, **111**: 1–433.
- Backhuys, W. & Boeters, H.D. 1974. Zur Kenntnis marokkanischer Binnenmollusken, 1. *Archiv für Molluskenkunde*, **104**(4–6): 107–114.
- Boeters, H.D. 1976. Hydrobiidae Tunisiens. *Archiv für Molluskenkunde*, **107**(1–3): 89–105.
- Boeters, H.D. 1998. Mollusca: Gastropoda: Superfamilie Rissooidea. In Schwoerbel, J. & Zwick, P. (Eds.), *Süßwasserfauna von Mitteleuropa*, Band 5/1–2. ix, 76 pp. Fischer, Stuttgart.
- Forcart, L. 1965. Rezente Land- und Süßwassermollusken der süditalienischen Landschaften Apulien, Basilicata und Calabrien. *Verhandlungen der Naturforschenden Gesellschaft in Basel*, **78**(1): 58–184.
- Gasull, L. 1965. Algunos moluscos terrestres y de agua dulce de Baleares. *Boletín de la Sociedad de Historia Natural de Baleares*, **11**(1–4): 7–161.
- Gittenberger, E., Janssen, A.W., Kuijper, W.J., Kuiper, J.G.J., Meijer, T., Van der Velde, G. & De Vries, J.N. 1998. Nederlandse fauna 2. De Nederlandse zoetwatermollusken. *Recente en fossiele weekdieren uit zoet en brak water*. 288 pp., 12 pls. Naturalis/KNNV/EIS, Leiden.
- Kadolsky, D. 1995. Stratigraphie und Molluskenfaunen von 'Landschneckenkalk' und 'Cerithienschichten' im Mainzer Becken (Oberoligozän bis Untermiozän?), 2: Revision der aquatischen Mollusken des Landschneckenkalkes. *Archiv für Molluskenkunde*, **124**(1–2): 1–55.

#### Comment on the proposed conservation of *Disparalona* Fryer, 1968 (Crustacea, Branchiopoda)

(Case 2990; see BZN 54: 89–91; 55: 105, 169; 56: 191)

Dietrich Flössner

Universität Jena, Institut für Ökologie, Arbeitsgruppe Limnologie, Jena, Germany

1. The describer of the genus *Phrixura*, P.E. Müller (1867), did not know that the individual of '*Phrixura rectirostris*' on which it was based was a teratologically

distorted animal, and that it was actually a specimen of the species known to him as *Alona rostrata* (Koch, 1841), which he dealt with and illustrated in the same paper (P.E. Müller, 1867, pp. 182–183). It is perfectly clear that had Müller known the teratological nature of this individual he would not have erected a new genus and species for its reception. On the contrary, had he known this, without the least difficulty he would have identified this problematic individual as the species well known to him as *A. rostrata*. This means that *Phrixura* is a junior synonym of *Alona* Baird, 1843. The creation of the new genus *Phrixura* was based on an unfortunate error. It is not in accord with the Code to support such a lapsus, especially when it concerns a species (*rostrata*) that has been internationally recognised as valid for more than 130 years since its publication.

2. The name *Phrixura* was never used for more than 120 years and cannot be employed on the basis of nomenclatural usage unless special grounds are put forward, which is not the case.

3. As noted in para. 6 of the application, Michael & Frey (1984) expressly referred to *Phrixura rectirostris* as a synonym of *Disparalona rostrata*, and clearly stated that it 'is an abnormal specimen of *D. rostrata*'. I can only fully and entirely agree. In no way, however, can I agree with Frey's later (1989) change to adopt the name *Phrixura*. This is a classic case of how a rigid, literal interpretation of the Code led to a completely unprofitable and harmful introduction of an unused name.

4. Given this state of affairs (paras. 1–3 above), I wish to protest that it is not a trifling matter to ignore the significance of the fact that the name *Disparalona* Fryer, 1968 has been in unambiguous and common use for about 30 years among specialists familiar with this group of animals (cf. Grygier's comment on BZN 55: 105, June 1998).

5. A morphologically comprehensive presentation and description of the taxon concerned were given by Michael & Frey (1984) under the name of *Disparalona rostrata*. It would be an irresponsible destabilisation of the nomenclature used for this species should *Phrixura rostrata* be adopted. Such a measure would stand in contradiction to the spirit and intention of the Code as clearly stated in the Preamble and Article 23b of the 1985 edition (Article 23.2 in that of 1999).

6. All decisive points, which unambiguously speak for a rejection of the name *Phrixura* P.E. Müller, 1867, have been convincingly set out by Fryer in Case 2990. I have nothing to add to them and stand fully and entirely behind the application.

7. In 1972 in the *Tierwelt Deutschlands* series I used the name *Disparalona rostrata* for the branchiopod in question (para. 7 of the application). In a new taxonomic monograph of the Cladocera of Central Europe, to appear in the year 2000, I will also be employing this name for the taxon since this is manifestly in the interest of nomenclatural stability.

**Comment on the proposed designation of a single neotype for *Hemibagrus nemurus* (Valenciennes, 1840) (Osteichthyes, Siluriformes) and *H. sieboldii* (Bleeker, 1846), and of the lectotype of *H. planiceps* (Valenciennes, 1840) as a neotype for *H. flavus* (Bleeker, 1846)**

(Case 3061; see BZN 56: 34–41, 200–201)

Maurice Kottelat

Route de la Baroche 12, Case postale 57, CH-2952 Cornol, Switzerland